

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant hereby responds to the Office Action of August 14, 2006. Reconsideration is requested.

The pending claims still subject to consideration are 1, 2, 4-7, 14-20 and 24. Claims 2 and 24 are currently amended.

Applicant notes that, on page 3 of the Amendment of June 8, 2006, Claims 5-7 were incorrectly designated as "Withdrawn".

Support for amendment to Claim 2

Claim 2 is currently amended to refer to "a carboxyl group of the PAA" rather than to "the carboxyl group of the PAA." This is consistent with the fact that the PAA will have multiple carboxyl groups and is also consistent with the language of Claim 1. The amendment is responsive to the Office Action (see below).

Claim 24 is amended so that it refers not only to coatings made from compositions of Claims 1 or 2, but also those made from compositions of Claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, or 17. Claims 4-7 and 14-17 are dependent on Claims 1 and/or 2, hence the basis for this amendment.

Cancellation of claims 25-49 (Paragraph 1 of Action)

These non-elected claims have been canceled.

Withdrawal of claims 3, 8-13 and 21-23 (Paragraph 2 of Office Action)

These non-elected claims have been canceled.

**Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 14-20 and 24 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph
(Paragraph 3 of Office Action)**

The Examiner has based this rejection in part on the grounds that, in Claim 2, the metes and bounds of “a molecule other than PAA” are indeterminate in scope. For example, according to the Examiner, it is unclear as to whether or not said molecule can be another molecule of the “crosslinker”. This rejection is traversed on the grounds that Claim 14 has been amended to make it clear that “the molecule other than the PAA” can be another molecule of the crosslinker.

The Examiner has based this rejection in part on the grounds that, in Claim 14, the language “one of the two other molecules” lacks express antecedent basis. In response, Applicant has amended Claim 14, replacing “one of the two other molecules” with “the molecule other than the PAA”.

The Examiner has based this rejection in part on the grounds that, in Claim 15, given that “said molecule other than the PAA” can be “another molecule of the crosslinker” (per claim 2), it is unclear how said crosslinker can be characterized as a “further” component. This rejection is traversed on the grounds that Claim 15 as amended is responsive to this objection.

The Examiner has based this rejection in part on the grounds that in Claims 16, 17 and 19, the language “the cross-linkable molecule” lacks express antecedent basis. This rejection is traversed on the grounds that Claims 16 and 17 have been amended so that the “cross-linkable

Application No. 10/716,843
Reply to Office Action of August 14, 2006

molecule” is now the “directly linkable molecule”, so that the language of those claims parallels the language of Claims 4 and 5 and furthermore finds support in the specification at page 10, line 11 to page 11, line 7, especially page 11, lines 3-7.

Rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US patent No. 4,832,808 (Buchwalter; Paragraph 6 of Office Action)

Claims 18-20 have been canceled rendering this rejection moot.

Rejection of Claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. as obvious over US patent No. 5,133,840 (Buchwalter; Paragraph 7 of Office Action)

Claims 18-20 have been canceled rendering this rejection moot.

Rejection of Claims 1,2, 4-7, 14-20 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ireland et al. (Paragraph 8 of Office Action)

Claims 18-20 have been canceled. As a result, this rejection applies to Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 14-17 and 24.

The Examiner has based this rejection on the grounds that Ireland discloses a composition that (1) comprises a product formed from the combination of a PAA and a triamine

and (2) may be used in combination with polyurethane and other molecules that would expect to form linkages with the product. This rejection is traversed on the grounds that follow:

Ireland states:

The composition of this invention may be used alone or in combination with other resins known for use in sizing applications such as, for example, polyurethane-, epoxy- or acrylic-based sizing compositions. (Ireland, Col. 10, lines 40-44; underlining added).

Ireland refers to sizing compositions and applications.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, and 14-20, on the other hand, refer to coating compositions.

Claim 24 refers to a coating that has been prepared from a coating composition and accordingly makes no reference to a sizing composition or sizing application.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants'

Application No. 10/716,843
Reply to Office Action of August 14, 2006

undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,
COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD.

October 30, 2006

Please charge or credit our
Account No. 03-0075 as necessary
to effect entry and/or ensure
consideration of this submission.

By Allan H. Fried

Allan H. Fried
Registration No. 31,253

Customer No. 03000
(215) 567-2010

Attorneys for Applicants